

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-26 were pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants seek to amend claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 12, 14, 18, 20, 22 and 26. No new matter is believed to be introduced by this Amendment, and its entry is respectfully requested. After entry of this Amendment, claims 1-26 are pending and presented for reconsideration. For the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nimmagadda (U.S. Patent No. 5,854,836); rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nimmagadda; and rejected claims 3, 8, 11, 17, 19 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nimmagadda in view of Telcordia (FSD01-02-1070, TR-NTW-001188, Issue 1, December, 1991). Applicants' Amendment of the claims is believed to overcome the rejections.

Regarding the rejection of claims 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nimmagadda, Applicants respectfully assert that Nimmagadda does not disclose each and every element recited in independent claims 5, 9, 14, 18 and 21.

Claim 5, for example, recites a combination comprising, in part, "receiv[ing] a CNAM query from a switch on which a called party is homed," "creating a duplicate LNP database


containing a plurality of LNP routing records,” and “routing the query directly to a CNAM LNP SCP, which is coupled to the duplicate LNP database and a CNAM database.”

In contrast, Nimmagadda does not teach at least “receiv[ing] a CNAM query from a switch on which a called party is homed,” “creating a duplicate LNP database containing a plurality of LNP routing records,” and “routing the query directly to a CNAM LNP SCP, which is coupled to the duplicate LNP database and a CNAM database,” as recited in claim 5.

Because Nimmagadda does not teach at least the claimed receiving, creating and routing, Applicants respectfully request that the § 102(b) rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn and the claim allowed. The rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn as well, at least in view of its dependence from allowable claim 5.

Similarly, claim 9 recites a combination comprising, in part, “receiv[ing] a CNAM query from a switch on which a called party is homed,” and a “CNAM LNP database accessible to the CNAM SCP that contains a plurality of LNP routing records that duplicate an existing LNP database.”

Nimmagadda does not teach “receiv[ing] a query from a switch on which a called party is homed” or a “CNAM LNP database accessible to the CNAM SCP that contains a plurality of LNP routing records that duplicate an existing LNP database,” as recited in claim 9. Because Nimmagadda does not teach each and every element of claim 9, the § 102(b) rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn as well, at least in view of its dependence from allowable claim 9.



Claim 14 recites, in part, "receiving a CNAM query from a switch on which a called party is homed, wherein the CNAM query contains a calling party telephone number," and "accessing a duplicate CNAM LNP database coupled to a CNAM SCP, containing a plurality of LNP routing records." In contrast, Nimmagadda does not teach at least "receiving a CNAM query from a switch on which a called party is homed, wherein the CNAM query contains a calling party telephone number," and "accessing a duplicate CNAM LNP database coupled to a CNAM SCP, containing a plurality of LNP routing records," as recited in claim 14. Because Nimmagadda does not teach each and every element of claim 14, Applicants respectfully request that the § 102(b) rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 recites, in part, "receiving a service request requesting the telephone service to be provided from a switch on which a called party is homed," and "a duplicate LNP database coupled to the service SCP for providing routing information based on identification information in the service request." In contrast, Nimmagadda does not teach at least "receiving a service request requesting the telephone service to be provided from a switch on which a called party is homed," and "a duplicate LNP database coupled to the service SCP for providing routing information based on identification information in the service request," as recited in claim 18. Because Nimmagadda does not teach every limitation of claim 18, the § 102(b) rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed. The rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn as well, at least in view of its dependence from allowable claim 18.


Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nimmagadda, Nimmagadda does not teach or suggest at least "receiv[ing] a CNAM query

A

from a switch” or “a duplicate local number portability signal control point (LNP SCP) database accessible to the CNAM SCP,” as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that the Official Notice taken by the Examiner regarding GTT being known in the art does not cure the deficiencies of Nimmagadda. Accordingly, at least because the suggested combination fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 1, the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed. The rejection of claims 2 and 4 should be withdrawn as well, at least in view of its dependence from allowable claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claims 7, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nimmagadda, Applicants established above that Nimmagadda does not teach or suggest all of the elements required by claims 7, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 20 by virtue of their dependence from allowable claims 5, 9, 14 and 18, respectively. Applicants respectfully assert that neither the Official Notice taken by the Examiner regarding GTT or display devices cures the deficiencies of Nimmagadda. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nimmagadda be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Regarding the rejection of claims 3, 8, 11, 17, 19 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nimmagadda in view of Telcordia, Nimmagadda does not teach or suggest all of the elements recited in claims 3, 8, 11, 17, 19 and 23-26, at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable claims 1, 5, 9, 14, 18 and 22, respectively. Telcordia, which discusses the process of porting a telephone number, does not cure the deficiencies of



Serial No.: 09/610,319
Art Unit: 2642

Attorney's Docket No.: BS99-177
Page 16

Nimmagadda. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review and withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 8, 11, 17, 19 and 22-26.


In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: September 22, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

J. CARL BEDINGFIELD ET AL.

By: 
David C. Isaacson
Registration No. 38,500

DCI/TLH/rrs

